

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matters of	)	
	)	
Petitions of the Verizon Telephone	)	
Companies for Forbearance Pursuant	)	WC Docket No. 06-172
to 47 U.S.C. § 160 in the Providence,	)	DA Number 06-2056
Boston, Philadelphia, Virginia Beach,	)	
Pittsburgh and New York Metropolitan	)	
Statistical Areas	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF QWEST CORPORATION**

Qwest Corporation (“Qwest”) hereby submits the following reply comments with respect to Verizon’s Petitions for Forbearance in the Boston, Providence, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Virginia Beach and New York Metropolitan Statistical Areas (“MSAs”).<sup>1</sup> Verizon has shown that barriers to entry in the local telecommunications market have been eliminated. Competitive providers have entered the market and captured substantial market share without reliance upon Verizon’s facilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitions of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance filed Sept. 6, 2006. *See* Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160 in the New York Metropolitan Statistical Area; Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160 in the Pittsburgh Metropolitan Statistical Area; Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160 in the Virginia Beach Metropolitan Statistical Area; Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160 in the Philadelphia Metropolitan Statistical Area; Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160 in the Boston Metropolitan Statistical Area; Petition of the Verizon Telephone Companies for Forbearance pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160 in the Providence Metropolitan Statistical Area; *and see* Public Notices, 21 FCC Rcd 10176 (2006), 21 FCC Rcd 11779 (2006), 21 FCC Rcd 14210 and 22 FCC Rcd 997 (2007).

Qwest takes this opportunity to address three issues. First, Qwest addresses the contention that the *Omaha Forbearance Order*<sup>2</sup> was wrongly decided. Second, Qwest refutes the argument that Qwest has driven McLeod from the Omaha MSA in the aftermath of the *Omaha Forbearance Order*. Finally, Qwest addresses comments regarding proof of competition in the six MSAs.

**A. The Omaha Forbearance Order Was Properly Decided**

First, a number of commenters claim that the *Omaha Order* was erroneous.<sup>3</sup> These commenters argue that the Federal Communications Commission (“Commission”) misconstrued the fully implemented provision of Section 160(d). Specifically, they argue that Section 160(d) requires something more than for the Commission to have entered rules implementing Section 251(c), and that those rules have gone into effect.<sup>4</sup> These commenters argue that Section 251(c) has not been fully implemented and that the Commission is not free to forbear from its enforcement. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld the Commission’s interpretation of Section 160(d) in the *Omaha Forbearance Order*. That court considered and rejected the argument advanced by these commenters.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, that court considered, and rejected, ACN’s argument that the Commission erred in relying on Qwest’s

---

<sup>2</sup> *In the Matter of Petition of Qwest Corporation for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) in the Omaha Metropolitan Statistical Area*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 20 FCC Rcd 19415 (2005) (“*Omaha Order*” or “*Omaha Forbearance Order*”), *aff’d sub nom.*, *Qwest Corp. v. FCC*, Nos. 05-1450, *et al.* (D.C. Cir. Mar. 23, 2007) (“*Qwest v. FCC*”).

<sup>3</sup> *See, e.g.*, ACN, *et al.* (“ACN”) at 49-67; Cavalier Telephone, LLC, *et al.* (“Cavalier”) at 3-8.

<sup>4</sup> ACN at 52-58; Cavalier at 3-8.

<sup>5</sup> Compare ACN at 51-58 with *Qwest v. FCC*, slip op. at 11-13.

special access, Section 271 and resale offerings in granting forbearance.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, Section 251(c) has been fully implemented and the Commission is free to forbear from its enforcement.

**B. The *Omaha Forbearance Order* Facilitated Competition In Omaha**

Second, commenters claim that the *Omaha Forbearance Order* destroyed competition in Omaha.<sup>7</sup> Integra resurrects McLeod's remark that McLeod may pull out of the Omaha market as "evidence" of this allegation. First, the goal of Section 251(c)(3) unbundling is not to protect CLECs. Rather, it is to facilitate entry into the telecommunications markets in order that consumers may benefit from competition. Imposing the costs of unbundling is not warranted after sufficient competition has been achieved, as it has in Omaha.'

In the *Omaha Forbearance Order* the Commission made clear that, in light of competition that did not rely upon unbundled network elements ("UNEs"), and particularly, in light of Cox's market share, Section 251(c)(3) Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost ("TELRIC") pricing is not necessary to ensure that charges, practices, classifications, and regulations are reasonable in the nine wire centers for which loop and transport unbundling were granted ("OFO wire centers").' The Commission expected that Qwest would continue to make wholesale loop and transport facilities available at just and reasonable rates and terms, although

---

<sup>6</sup> Compare ACN at 58-67 with *Qwest v. FCC*, slip op. at 16-18. While competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs") participating in the appeal of the *Omaha Forbearance Order* did not raise the argument that the Commission may not decouple Section 10 Forbearance from Section 251(d)(2) impairment, see ACN at 49-51, the D.C. Circuit did consider, and reject, the argument that the *Omaha Forbearance Order* impermissibly contradicts the *Triennial Review Remand Order*. See *Qwest v. FCC*, slip op. at 15-16.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., Integra at 2-5; Time Warner Telecom at 4, 46-47; EarthLink, Inc. and New Edge Network, Inc. at 44.

<sup>8</sup> *Omaha Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 19454 ¶¶ 76-77.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 19467-68 ¶ 105.

not at TELRIC rates." In addition, the Commission expected that Qwest would continue to make special access services available subject to tariff or contract filing requirements." As Qwest explained in its January 22, 2007 ex parte, consistent with the Commission's predictive judgment, Qwest is not curtailing wholesale access to analog DSO, DS1 and DS3 capacity facilities in the OFO wire centers.<sup>12</sup> Qwest's motivation is to sell as much service as possible, while making a reasonable profit. Despite the fact that Qwest and McLeod have not yet reached agreement on an amendment reflecting the Omaha forbearance grant, Qwest has been able to reach agreement reflecting that decision with other CLECs in the Omaha MSA. Thus, there is no question that Qwest is continuing to make loops and transport available at wholesale in the OFO wire centers, and throughout the Omaha MSA, as required by the Commission.<sup>13</sup>

In sum, Integra is incorrect in suggesting that the *Omaha Forbearance Order* adversely impacted competition in Omaha

**C. The Commission Should Not Increase The Burden On Verizon To Provide Competitive Evidence**

Third, some commenters complain that Verizon is not entitled to relief because it did not provide adequate evidence of competition. While Qwest does not enter the fray regarding where competition does or does not exist in the six MSAs, Qwest will address the standard to which Verizon should be held.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 19448-49 ¶ 67.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 19455 ¶ 80.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* ¶ 79; *see also* Qwest ex parte filed Jan. 22, 2007 in WC Docket Nos. 04-22? and 05-281 at 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A.

<sup>13</sup> Moreover, in January 2007, McLeod sent a letter to its customers stating that it would start assessing a surcharge beginning February 15, 2007. *See* Exhibit B. Obviously McLeod's market position has not been negatively impacted if it feels it can raise prices. It strains credulity to contend that McLeod is forced to exit a market, while McLeod not only remains in the market, but also imposes higher charges on its customers.

Some of the commenters complain that Verizon has not provided evidence of the percentage of customer premises that competitors serve in each Verizon wire center in each MSA.<sup>14</sup> Tying any forbearance grant to a test based on incumbent local exchange carrier (“ILEC”) wire-center service areas does not fully gauge market competition because ILEC wire centers do not bear any relationship to the manner in which competitors actually enter and serve markets, particularly competitors that do not rely upon the ILEC’s loop and transport UNEs.<sup>15</sup> Specifically, ILEC wire centers have no practical relationship to the networks of cable operators, wireless carriers, and Voice over Internet Protocol (“VoIP”) providers.

Moreover, even if the Commission were to rely on a wire center specific test, as it did in the *Omaha Order*, commenters ask the Commission to deny Verizon forbearance because Verizon cannot tell with specificity exactly where its competitors have facilities.<sup>16</sup> These commenters do not deny that the information is not in Verizon’s possession; rather, it is in the hands of Verizon’s competitors.<sup>17</sup> Yet, the commenters would deny Verizon forbearance because it does not provide information which it does not possess. Verizon has provided evidence sufficient to warrant a finding that its cable competitors are prevalent throughout the six MSAs. Should the opponents seek to rebut Verizon’s showing, they should provide the evidence upon which they rely.

Similarly, Cox tries to increase the burden on Verizon over the level imposed upon Qwest in Omaha, arguing that in order to obtain forbearance from unbundling, Verizon must

---

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., ACN at 15-17.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Omaha Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 19450-51 ¶ 69 and n. 187.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., ACN at 15-17; Broadview Networks, Inc., *et al.* at 14-19; Comcast Corporation at 5-6; CompTel at 29-31.

<sup>17</sup> See *Omaha Forbearance Order* at n. 187 (“There is no evidence in the record to suggest that Qwest is able to discern exactly where its facilities-based competitors are capable of providing service[.]”).

show that it has “strong and stable competitors and that those competitors can obtain necessary network facilities from providers other than Verizon.”<sup>18</sup> If Cox means that Verizon must show that there is competition in the wholesale market, Cox is seeking to change the standard from that used in the *Omaha Forbearance Order*. There, the record did “not reflect any significant alternative sources of wholesale inputs for carriers[.]”<sup>19</sup> Rather, the Commission found that Qwest’s own wholesale offerings would continue to be adequate without unbundled loop and transport offerings.” Accordingly, to the extent Verizon makes a similar competitive showing to that in Omaha, the Commission should not require Verizon to provide evidence of competition in the wholesale market.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, this Commission should conclude that the requirements of Section 251(c) have been fully implemented within the meaning of Section 160(d); that granting the *Omaha Forbearance Order* did nothing to harm competition in Omaha; that a wire-center based test for forbearance is not necessary since competitors neither enter nor compete in

---

<sup>18</sup> Cox Communications, Inc. at 8-9.

<sup>19</sup> *Omaha Forbearance Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 19448-49 ¶ 67.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

markets based upon wire center definitions; and that the Commission should not increase the burden on Verizon to prove competition over that placed upon Qwest in the *Omaha Forbearance Order*.

Respectfully submitted,

QWEST CORPORATION

By: /s/ Daphne E. Butler  
Craig J. Brown  
Daphne E. Butier  
Suite 950  
607 14<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(303) 383-6653

Its Attorneys

April 18, 2007

EXHIBIT A



**Qwest**  
607 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 950  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone 202-429-3120  
Facsimile 202-293-0561

**Melissa E. Newman**  
Vice President - Federal Regulatory

*EX PARTE*

*Electronic Filing via ECFS*

January 22, 2007

Marlene H. Dortch  
secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: *In the Matter of Petition of Qwest Corporation for Forbearance Pursuant  
to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) in the Omaha Metropolitan Statistical Area –  
WC Docket No. 04-223*

*In the Matter of Petition of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. Pursuant to Section 10  
of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for Forbearance from  
Sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1) in the Anchorage LEC Study Area –  
WC Docket No. 05-281*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Qwest hereby submits the attached *ex parte* for inclusion on the record in the above-referenced proceedings.

This submission is made pursuant to Sections 1.49(f) and 1.1206(b) of the rules of the Federal Communications Commission, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.49(f), 1.1206(b).

Please contact me at 202.429.3120 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Melissa E. Newman

Attachment

Copy via email to:

Michelle Carey ([michelle.carey@fcc.gov](mailto:michelle.carey@fcc.gov))

Scott Deutchman ([scott.deutchman@fcc.gov](mailto:scott.deutchman@fcc.gov))

Ian Dillner ([ian.dillner@fcc.gov](mailto:ian.dillner@fcc.gov))

Russell Hanser ([russell.hanser@fcc.gov](mailto:russell.hanser@fcc.gov))



---

**EXHIBIT A**

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
January 22, 2007

Page 2 of 2

Thomas Navin ([thomas.navin@fcc.gov](mailto:thomas.navin@fcc.gov))  
Julie Veach ([julie.veach@fcc.gov](mailto:julie.veach@fcc.gov))  
Jeremy Miller ([jeremy.miller@fcc.gov](mailto:jeremy.miller@fcc.gov))  
Tim Stelzig ([tim.stelzig@fcc.gov](mailto:tim.stelzig@fcc.gov))

EXHIBIT A



**Qwest**  
1801 California Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Phone 303-383-6653  
Facsimile 303-896-1107

**Daphne E. Butler**  
Senior Attorney

Via ECFS

EX PARTE

January 22, 2007

Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: *In the Matter of Petition of Qwest Corporation for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) in the Omaha Metropolitan Statistical Area – WC Docket No. 04-223*

*In the Matter of Petition of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. Pursuant to Section 10 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for Forbearance from Sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1) in the Anchorage LEC Study Area – WC Docket No. 05-281*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On December 15 and on December 21, 2006 representatives of McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. ("McLeod"), met with the Federal Communications Commission ("Commission") to discuss the ACS of Anchorage Forbearance Petition and memorialized those discussions in written *ex partes* filed with the Secretary. It appears from the written submissions that in the course of these meetings McLeod made several representations regarding the status of competition in the Omaha Metropolitan Statistical Area ("MSA") and specifically regarding Qwest Corporation's ("Qwest") willingness to negotiate with McLeod subsequent to the Commission's grant of Qwest's Petition for Forbearance in the Omaha MSA. McLeod has competed based upon Unbundled Network Elements ("UNE") in Omaha, and appears to be disgruntled because pursuant to the *Omaha Order*,<sup>1</sup> Qwest has asked McLeod to

---

<sup>1</sup> *In the Matter of Petition of Qwest Corporation for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) in the Omaha Metropolitan Statistical Area*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 20 FCC Rcd 19415 (2005) ("Omaha Order" or "Omaha Forbearance Order"), *pets. for review pending sub nom., Qwest Corp. v. FCC*, Nos. 05-1450, *et al.* (D.C. Cir. filed Dec. 12, 2005), *Oral Argument* set for Feb. 6, 2007.

## EXHIBIT A

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
January 22, 2007

Page 2 of 5

negotiate an alternative to UNE loops and transport in nine wire centers. Qwest takes this opportunity to respond to McLeod's representations regarding negotiations and pricing.

In light of facilities-based competition in the mass market in the Omaha MSA, the Commission granted Qwest forbearance from providing UNE loops and transport at Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost ("TELRIC") prices in nine wire centers ("OFO wire centers").<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the Commission explicitly did not consider UNE-based competition to support the forbearance grant.<sup>3</sup> Rather, the Commission stated that it was considering only the competition that did not rely on UNEs.<sup>4</sup> That competition includes intermodal facilities-based competition (especially from Cox Communications, Inc. ("Cox")), and the Qwest Platform Plus ("QPP") commercial offering, and resale.<sup>5</sup>

In the *Omaha Forbearance Order* the Commission made clear that in light of the non-UNE competition, particularly in light of Cox's market share, Section 251(c)(3) TELRIC pricing is not necessary to ensure that the Section 10(a) standards are met in the OFO wire centers.<sup>6</sup> The Commission fully expected that Qwest would continue to make wholesale loop and transport facilities available at just and reasonable rates and terms, although not at TELRIC rates.<sup>7</sup> In addition, the Commission expected that Qwest would continue to make special access services available subject to tariff or contract filing requirements.<sup>8</sup>

Consistent with the Commission's predictive judgment, Qwest is not curtailing wholesale access to analog DSO, DS1 and DS3 capacity facilities in the OFO wire centers.<sup>9</sup> Qwest's motivation is to sell as much service as possible, while making a reasonable profit. In order to achieve that goal Qwest has had a number of private line/special access discount plans available for a number of years. Despite the fact that Qwest and McLeod have not yet reached agreement on an amendment reflecting the Omaha forbearance grant, Qwest has been able to reach agreement reflecting that decision with other Competitive Local Exchange Carriers ("CLECs") in the Omaha MSA. Thus, there is no question that Qwest is continuing to make loops and transport available at wholesale in the OFO wire centers, and throughout the Omaha MSA, as required by the Commission.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 19447 ¶ 64.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 19449-50 ¶ 6%.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 19448-49 ¶ 67.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 19467-68 ¶ 105.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 19448-49 ¶ 67.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 19455 ¶ 80.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* ¶ 79.

## EXHIBIT A

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
January 22, 2007

Page 3 of 5

Specifically as to McLeod, Qwest actually initiated discussions with McLeod regarding all of its private line purchases from Qwest, which would include McLeod's potential purchases in the OFO wire centers. Qwest shared with McLeod the possible structure of such a deal, and asked McLeod to provide approximate forecasted volumes and revenue in order for Qwest to provide accurate pricing. Although McLeod agreed to provide forecasts of volumes and revenues, in order to negotiate a commercial agreement customized to meet their unique needs, McLeod has yet to provide the data after numerous months. Qwest even suggested a weekly conference call between the parties in order to ensure that the negotiations moved forward. McLeod has simply failed to show up for a number of recent calls.

McLeod had another solution available for some of the OFO wire centers. In addition to Qwest's attempt to negotiate a "global" private line deal, which would include all of the OFO nine wire centers, Qwest after the *Triennial Review Remand Order* ("TRRO") ran a promotion specifically to provide CLECs some price relief for high capacity facilities in non-impaired wire centers. Two of the nine Omaha wire centers were on that list. McLeod did not take advantage of that offer.<sup>10</sup> The promotion after the TRRO did not generate many sales. Accordingly, Qwest did not run a promotion targeted to the OFO wire centers in response to the *Omaha Forbearance Order* because there was no market-based reason to offer a promotion in a more limited number of central offices, when the larger TRRO-related promotion did not generate much response.

In addition to these efforts to provide McLeod with price relief on private line services, Qwest has made repeated requests of McLeod to negotiate an amendment to their Interconnection Agreement to reflect the changes resulting from the forbearance grant. Qwest and McLeod first met several months ago to begin negotiations on what McLeod called a "commercial agreement plan". In good faith and in hopes of reaching a commercial agreement under Qwest's many tariff options, Qwest has continued to allow McLeod to purchase Loop and Transport facilities out of its interconnection agreement in the OFO wire centers.<sup>11</sup> In the meetings with McLeod it has become apparent that McLeod's desire is to develop a contract that will provide TELRIC-like rates for Private Line services that Qwest normally sells out of its FCC Tariff No. 1. Thus, McLeod's complaint that Qwest is not providing just and reasonable

---

<sup>10</sup> In fact, McLeod has not signed an amendment reflecting the *Triennial Review Order* and the *Triennial Review Remand Order*, which issued in February 2005, ten months before the *Omaha Forbearance Order*.

<sup>11</sup> Qwest expects to back bill McLeod after the parties reach agreement on a rate for the period after the six month transition ended on March 16, 2006. During the period from November 2005 (just before the December 2005 release of the *Order* granting forbearance) to November 2006, McLeod has actually increased the volume of DS1 Loops and Enhanced Extended Links ("EEL") that it is purchasing from Qwest as UNEs.

## EXHIBIT A

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
January 22, 2007

Page 4 of 5

pricing under Section 271,<sup>12</sup> is really a complaint that Qwest will not agree to TELRIC pricing. Qwest has made it clear to McLeod that Qwest will no longer offer TELRIC pricing in the OFO wire centers. As can be seen from the examples recounted above, Qwest is prepared to offer McLeod pricing more favorable than the month-to-month rates found in its FCC Tariff No. 1 that McLeod appears to use in its rate comparisons.

Even if Qwest were not offering pricing more favorable than the month-to-month rates found in its FCC Tariff No. 1, McLeod would still be incorrect in arguing that Qwest has failed to offer just and reasonable pricing under Section 271. The *Triennial Review Order* states: “whether a particular checklist element’s rate satisfies the *just and reasonable pricing standard of section 201 and 202* is a fact-specific inquiry that the Commission will undertake in the context of a BOC’s application for section 271 authority or in an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to section 271(d)(6). We note, however, that for a given purchasing carrier, a BOC might satisfy this standard by demonstrating that *the rate for a section 271 network element is at or below the rate at which the BOC offers comparable functions to similarly situated purchasing carriers under its interstate access tariff*, to the extent such analogues exist. Alternatively, a BOC might demonstrate that *the rate at which it offers a section 271 network element is reasonable by showing that it has entered into arms-length agreements with other, similarly situated purchasing carriers to provide the element at that rate.*”<sup>13</sup>

Qwest can meet each of these standards. The rates that it is offering to McLeod are at or below the rates in its interstate access tariff for the comparable special access services. Secondly, Qwest has entered into arms-length agreements with other CLECs to provide the elements at the rates it is offering to McLeod. McLeod is simply incorrect when it accuses Qwest of failing to offer just and reasonable pricing for Section 271 network elements.

In sum, McLeod is incorrect in suggesting that Qwest is not meeting the Commission’s expectations in the wake of the *Omaha Forbearance Order*. In fact, Qwest initiated conversations with McLeod in order to try to negotiate pricing on private line services that meet the business needs of both Qwest and McLeod. In addition, McLeod did not take up Qwest’s

---

<sup>12</sup> See Letter to Marlene H. Dortch, Federal Communications Commission from Patrick J. Donovan, Bingham McCutchen LLP, counsel for McLeod, WC Docket No. 04-223, dated Dec. 19, 2006.

<sup>13</sup> See *In the Matter of Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability*, Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 18 FCC Rcd 16978, 17389 ¶ 664 (2003), corrected by *Triennial Review Order Errata*, 18 FCC Rcd at 19020, *aff’d in part, remanded in part, vacated in part*, *United States Telecom Ass’n v. FCC*, 359 F.3d 554 (D.C. Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 125 S. Ct. 313, 316, 345 (2004).

## EXHIBIT A

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
January 22, 2007

Page 5 of 5

*TRRO*-related offer of favorable pricing in two of the OFO wire centers. Finally, as a legal matter, Qwest's offers to McLeod are reasonable because they comply with the standard that the Commission has set forth for judging whether pricing for Section 271 network elements is just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Daphne E. Butler

EXHIBIT B



PO. Box 3177  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52406-3177

mcleodusa.com

January 8, 2007

Dear McLeodUSA Customer:

Thank you for doing business with McLeodUSA. Due to regulatory changes adopted by the Federal Communications Commission, McLeodUSA is being charged higher costs for interconnecting with AT&T and Qwest's local networks. Beginning February 15, 2007, an Access Recovery Surcharge is to be applied to monthly recurring charges (charges for usage, nonrecurring charges, taxes and other surcharges will not be used in calculating the Access Recovery Surcharge) based on the scale below at all locations where permitted.

Therefore, McLeodUSA is proposing the following change to its charges:

\$0.00	to	\$100.00	10.00%
\$100.01	to	\$200.00	9.00%
\$200.01	to	\$400.00	8.00%
\$400.01	to	\$800.00	5.00%
\$800.01	to	\$1,500.00	4.00%
\$1,500.01	to	\$2,500.00	3.00%
\$2,500.01	to	Unlimited	0.00%

McLeodUSA is committed to answering your questions about our service, explaining all aspects of your monthly bill and providing you with the personal attention you deserve. If you should have any questions, please call a McLeodUSA StarQuality® Certified Customer Care Representative at 1-800-593-1177.

Again, we thank you for your business.

Sincerely,

McLeodUSA

Manage your account online at [www.McLeodUSA.com/YourAccount](http://www.McLeodUSA.com/YourAccount)

McLeodUSA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Richard Grozier, do hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing **REPLY**  
**COMMENTS OF QWEST CORPORATION** to be: 1) filed with the FCC via its  
Electronic Comment Filing System in WC Docket No. 06-172; 2) served, via e-mail on  
Ms. Janice Myles, Wireline Competition Bureau, Competition Policy Division at  
[Janice.myles@fcc.gov](mailto:Janice.myles@fcc.gov); 3) served, via e-mail on the FCC's duplicating contractor Best Copy and  
Printing, Inc. at [fcc@bcpiweb.com](mailto:fcc@bcpiweb.com); and 4) served, via First Class United States mail, postage  
prepaid, on the parties listed on the attached service list.

/s/ Richard Grozier  
Richard Grozier

April 18, 2007



Andrew D. Lipman. .... .ACN, et al.  
Russell M. Blau ..... ..Cavalier, et al.  
Joshua M. Bobeck  
Philip J. Macres  
Bingham McCutchen  
2020 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Brad Mutschelknaus. .... .Broadview, et al.  
Genevieve Morelli  
Edward A. Yorgitis, Jr.  
Kelley Drye & Warren  
Washington Harbour  
Suite 400  
3050 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20007

Mitchel Ahlbaum  
New York City Department of Information  
Technology and Telecommunications  
9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
75 Park Place  
New York, NY 10007

Michael C. Athay  
Robert A. Sutton  
Jennifer Miller Kurzweg  
The City of Philadelphia  
17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1515 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Brian A. Rankin  
Susan Jin Davis  
Comcast Cable Communications, LLC  
1500 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19102

James R. Coltharp  
Mary P. McManus  
Comcast Corporation  
Suite 500  
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Washington, DC 20006

Mary C. Albert  
COMPTel  
Suite 400  
900 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

J. G. Harrington. .... .COX  
Jason E. Rademacher  
Dow Lohnes PLLC  
Suite 500  
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Michael W. Fleming. .... .Integra  
Edward S. Quill  
Williams Mullen  
Suite 700  
8270 Greensboro Drive  
McLean, VA 22102

Jay Nusbaum  
Integra Telecom, Inc.  
Suite 500  
1201 N.E. Lloyd Boulevard  
Portland, OR 97232

Daniel L. Brenner  
Steven F. Morris  
National Cable & Telecommunications  
Association  
Suite 100  
25 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-1431

Charles Acquard  
National Association of State Utility  
Consumer Advocates  
Suite 101  
8380 Colesville Road  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Gerald A. Norlander  
Public Utility Law Project of New York, Inc.  
Suite 420  
194 Washington Avenue  
Albany, NY 12210

Joel H. Cheskis  
Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Forum Place  
555 Walnut Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Meredith A. Hatfield  
State of New Hampshire  
Office of Consumer Advocate  
Suite 18  
21 South Fruit Street  
Concord, NH 03301

Mary J. Healey  
State of Connecticut  
Office of Consumer Counsel  
10 Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051

Chana S. Wilkerson  
Office of People's Counsel  
Suite 2102  
6 Saint Paul Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Ronald K. Chen  
Seema M. Singh  
Christopher J. White  
New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel  
11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
31 Clinton Street  
Newark, NJ 07101

Stephen T. Perkins  
Cavalier Telephone  
1319 Ingleside Road  
Norfolk, VA 23502-1914

C. Meade Browder Jr.  
Ashley C. Beuttel  
Virginia Office of Attorney General  
900 East Main Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Martha Coakley  
Jamie M. Tosches  
Joseph W. Rogers  
Office of Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 02108

Randolph Wu  
Helen Mickiewicz  
Jane Whang  
California Public Utilities and the  
People of the State of California  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Vonya B. McCann  
John E. Benedict  
Sprint Nextel Corporation  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
2001 Edmund Halley Drive  
Reston, VA 20191

Andrew D. Lipman..... Telecom Investors  
Russell M. Blau  
Harry N. Malone  
Bingham McCutchen  
2020 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Steven N. Teplitz  
Time Warner Inc.  
Suite 800  
800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Julie Y. Patterson  
Time Warner Cable  
290 Harbor Drive  
Stamford, CT 06902

Joseph K. Witmer  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Mark J. O'Connor..... .EarthLink  
Lamper & O'Connor, P.C.  
Suite 700  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

K. C. Halm..... .Monmouth  
Christopher W. Savage  
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP  
Suite 200  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Colleen Boothby.. ..AD HOC  
Levine, Blaszak, Block & Boothby  
Ninth Floor  
2001 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Dr Lee L. Selwyn  
Susan M. Gately  
Helen Golding  
Economics and Technology, Inc.  
15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
One Washington Mall  
Boston, MA 02108

Christopher Putala  
Paul Kenefick  
Earthlink, Inc.  
Suite 325  
575 7<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004

John T. Nakahata.....New Edge  
Stephanie Weiner  
Justin Dillon  
Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis LLP  
1200 Eighteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036